



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

these objects (and we believe that they enter closely into the great work), let them be cultivated with enthusiasm, as virtues ; and, so far as they *then* give pleasure, they yield a natural fruit.

- ART. VI. — 1. *The Planter's Plea ; or, the Grounds of Plantations examined, and Usual Objections answered. Together with a Manifestation of the Causes moving such as have lately undertaken a Plantation in New England ; for the Satisfaction of those that question the Lawfulness of the Action.* 2 Thess. v. 21. "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." London : 1630. 4to. pp. 84.
2. *An Historical Discourse, delivered by Request before the Citizens of New Haven, April 25, 1838, the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the First Settlement of the Colony ;* by JAMES L. KINGSLEY. New Haven : 1838. 8vo. pp. 115.
3. *Thirteen Historical Discourses, on the Completion of Two Hundred Years from the Beginning of the First Church in New Haven, with an Appendix.* By LEONARD BACON, Pastor of the First Church in New Haven. New Haven : 1839. 8vo. pp. 400.
4. *The New York Review.* Number XI., for January, 1840. [Article 2. *Politics of the Puritans.*]

WE cannot pretend to say much for the first of the above works, on the score of novelty. In a very early stage of our labors, when noticing various tracts which relate to the primitive times of this country, we gave to it such a share of our attention as we supposed it to deserve.* And within a very short time we have done our best to recommend to the public the Discourses by Professor Kingsley and Mr. Bacon, the titles of which follow in our list.† Having thus performed our duty, we should not probably have been tempted again to bring them up, had they not been made the groundwork and justification for an extraordinary commentary in the pages of the

* *North American Review*, Vol. II. pp. 145 *et seq.*

† *Ibid.*, Vol. XLVII. pp. 480 *et seq.*, and pp. 161 – 173 of the present volume.

“New York Review,” the heading of which is also given above. It is to this commentary that we now propose to direct our particular attention, and we join the other works only because they are incidentally necessary to our purpose and cannot be separated from it. They have furnished the opportunity, which, it seems, has been watched for, of making a general attack upon the whole edifice of New England History ; an attack which we regret on many accounts, but more particularly on two. The first, that it should have originated in so respectable a quarter ; and the second, that it compels us to assume an attitude of controversy in our defence, which it is as little agreeable to our taste to seek, as, when unavoidable, it is in our disposition to fear.

The process by which truth is established in this world is for the most part a slow and painful one. A mere accident will often appear to strike it into the mind of a single man, from whom it will pass to his neighbours, until it gradually attains to that degree of universal consent and acknowledgment, which will justify the claim for the human race, that it has made another step in its advancing progress. The fall of an apple to the ground was to the mental faculties of Newton as flint to the steel, and produced a permanent light, ever after to illumine the world. So the hesitating dislike of the monk Tetzels formed the stimulus to those vehement energies in Luther, which worked out in their career an entire revolution in the moral and political doctrines of civilization. Yet, though the results thus reached must be admitted to have sprung from such very small beginnings, there is no person at this day likely to undervalue them on that account alone, or to take away from the individuals who originated them the degree of credit for their agency which they most richly deserve. Through them the intellect of mankind may be said to have bridged a chasm, and the genius and learning of future ages might, with perfect safety, be let out to roam after more remote and yet undiscovered truth, without being exposed to the risk of having the earth open beneath their feet, or of being called back from less investigated paths to the duty of resetting landmarks in those already passed.

Among the truths, which may be regarded as thus firmly established, are the principles at the root of the civil and religious rights which every citizen of New England now enjoys.

And in looking after the origin of their establishment, we did not suppose that there could be any more hesitation in ascribing it to the agency of the Puritans, than in ascribing the doctrine of gravitation to Newton, or the overthrow of the infallibility of Rome to Luther. When the scorner and the skeptic had bowed to the majesty of truth in the persons the most abhorrent to his nature, when authors of all shades and degrees of religious, moral, or political opinion had united in conceding this as certain, we could hardly have expected, at this late day, and least of all in these United States, a revocation of it into doubt. Yet the fact is even so. We are called upon to do no less than to reform all our existing notions ; to go back to a new political primer ; to remodel written history and documents ; to bow to new authorities. We must hereafter eschew all respect for the Puritans as champions of our liberty, and transfer it to the Stuart monarchs on the throne of England. We must "look down" upon our ancestors as the opponents of the privileges we enjoy, and "look up" to the common law of the mother country as the source from which we gained them, in spite of their efforts to cut it off. Such are the new lessons in history which our worthy contemporary in New York is reading to the growing community of these States ; and, if they are true, great indeed must be the change of opinion which they will occasion. Our schools, our colleges, our public men, and the distinguished writers of this and other countries, are all infected with the most pestilent error. And the hallucination, which this "historico-optical illusion," to use the term of our brother reviewers, has occasioned, has reached to such a height, that we nearly despair of seeing any effort of theirs at all equal to successful remedy or counteraction.

But, before we proceed any further, let it be clearly understood, that, in what we are about to say to the Reviewers, we seek for no causes of offence to the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church, as established in America. Neither do we perceive the least necessity for introducing sectarian feelings of any kind into the discussion. We have no reason for supposing that Episcopalians in the United States, merely because they are such, have any disposition at this time of day to make battle for all of the same persuasion, who have happened to live in past time on the other side of the water.

We hardly imagine they will exalt the memory of Henry the Eighth, merely because he founded the Church, or that they will overlook the violence of Laud, and the bigotry of his master, simply because they rank high in the list of martyrs in her cause. Seeing that these points are generally conceded in England itself, and that the Church did at last contribute to the final overthrow of the Stuart dynasty, we do not perceive any necessity for maintaining here the political doctrines which made them odious, even there. That such necessity should have been supposed to devolve upon the "New York Review," even by reason of any cause of offence believed to have been given by Messrs. Kingsley and Bacon in their remarks, is to us surprising. We cannot credit, that either of those gentlemen had the remotest idea of advancing "personal, political, or sectarian interests," by their productions. Nor yet could they have wished "to exalt the Puritan fathers of New England with a view of giving a *hostile* bearing, more or less directly, upon those who have not seen good to take them as authority in matters of religious faith and discipline." The insinuation and the suspicion are worthy of each other ; particularly as they stand in the face of earnest and express disclaimers on the part of both those gentlemen, and of a paragraph of Mr. Kingsley which is so strikingly just, that we cannot do better than to close with it this part of what we have to say. "It is an obvious remark," he says, "that many of the relations of different sects to each other in former times, have ceased to exist ; and *that the faults of none originating in causes, which no longer operate, should be considered the inheritance of the present generation.*" All have now full opportunity to show the excellences of their respective systems, unincumbered with the past." This is good advice, particularly when coming from one who frankly admits that all have something to regret, and we are only sorry that it does not appear to have been taken in the spirit in which it was meant.

There is, however, one great difficulty in the treatment of this matter, which we scarcely know how to avoid. We mean the temptation it holds forth to go over what has already been discussed to satiety. It is as little consistent with our design to open with commonplace panegyric of the Puritans, as it is to join in with their revilers. The main points on each side

of the controversy they have occasioned are so hackneyed by this time, that we are sure our readers will excuse our disinclination even to approach them. Yet it is hardly possible to follow the precise line of truth, without danger of being drawn into the abyss. And when once involved, it is still less so, to adhere to that calmness of judgment without which there is no hope of extrication. Luckily for us, in this dilemma, we are likely to be helped out by the somewhat original mode of thinking which our contemporary has adopted, and by the duty we are under rather to follow the path marked out for us than to open any of our own. And this we hope to do as closely as it is possible.

The first proposition which the Reviewers advance, is, that "the nature of the contest in England between Churchmen and Puritans was merely a political one, and *not*, as is usually represented, a religious one." And this they support by the argument we now subjoin.

"This may fairly be inferred, from what is said by both of our authors. Professor Kingsley tells us, (Disc. p. 55,) 'their (the Puritans') opposition to the Church of England was mainly political, and limited in a great measure to discipline.' And Mr. Bacon tells us, (Disc. p. 14,) that, 'of the many Puritans who came to New England at its first planting, none, save the pilgrims of Plymouth, had denounced the Church of England, or had separated themselves from its communion.' And in another place he asks, 'What were the Puritans? Let sober history answer. They were a great religious and political party, in a country and in an age in which every man's religion was a matter of political regulation. They were, in their day, the reforming party in the Church and state of England.' (p. 34.) But when we say it was a political controversy, we do not mean that nothing was said concerning religion, nor even that the Puritans did not profess to be seeking its promotion; but we intend to assert the plain and simple proposition, that the *REAL* contest between Churchmen and Puritans was *FOR THE POLITICAL ASCENDENCY*; Churchmen desiring to continue prelacy as the religion of state, while the Puritans were striving to elevate Presbyterianism to the same post; both parties, the meanwhile, professing to be influenced *solely* by a regard for religion, and having its best interests deeply at heart. If, therefore, the *professions* of these parties are to be taken as evidence of the nature of the controversy, it was purely a religious one; but, if we judge of the

nature of that controversy as we do of those of later days, *by the end sought*, we cannot hesitate to conclude that it was *political*. So long, then, as the ulterior object of any party is to gain the political supremacy, no matter what their pretensions may be, whether to purify the church, to establish a new religion or a new form of discipline, to introduce better laws or wiser rulers, — still, the end being political, the contest is political.” — p. 53.

We have extracted the whole of this passage, with its emphatic words and small capitals, because it appears to us to be the basis of whatever of argument can be found in the remainder of the article. We have no hesitation in at once declaring, that it fails to support the proposition advanced upon it. There is a change of language in it, which may deceive the unwary, but which cannot stand the test of a moment's scrutiny. Neither Mr. Bacon nor Professor Kingsley admits, that the contest between Churchmen and Puritans was *merely* a political one, — nor would it have been true, if they had done so. The latter gentleman, in our opinion, goes too far when he says, it was “*mainly* political”; the former states the case right when he describes it as “a religious, *and* a political contest, when religion was a matter of political regulation.” Hence the political struggle on the part of the least powerful party in religion, was one not of their seeking. The religious scruple became a political question, only because the King and the Church insisted upon shutting up every other avenue to its indulgence. To show this clearly, it is only necessary to look back to the origin of the Reformation in England. When Henry the Eighth quarrelled with the Pope, he lifted the great barrier to the progress of the new opinions. This was very unintentionally done on his part, it is true; but still, once done, the deed could not be undone. And, having been done, it was not possible that the privilege of thought and reasoning upon religious subjects, thus newly obtained by the people, would not lead to great diversities of sentiment. The triumph of the Reformation was secured; but it was not practicable to dictate the precise degree to which that triumph should be carried; nor, where men are constituted as they now are, to require that they should all stop short at the word of command, and be ready to arrange their future creed exactly by the rule which was

thereafter to be measured to them by the sovereign power. The attempt to measure out such a rule was the grand mistake of the Tudor and Stuart princes, persevered in until it levelled the throne itself to the dust. The position taken for the English Church was a false position, and one in direct resistance to all experience of human nature. For it commanded dissent from the ancient doctrine, and yet left no room for opinion to exercise itself. It stimulated to reflection, and then punished the indulgence of it. It first treated man as a rational being, and then prescribed to him the uniformity of attitude which can be got only from blocks. In an age of excitement, when the mind, just freed from its fetters, was revelling and gambolling in the very wantonness of its newly-acquired power, it undertook to check these extravagances as if they were crimes. And, when the furious battle arose between the old and the new opinions, it ventured to assume a middle position, which, like all middle positions, satisfied neither party, and stimulated the ardor for victory in both. The Puritan directed his attack against the Church, only because he regarded it as the lurking-place from which Romanism might again spring out upon him, and bind him hand and foot, a slave for ever after to the Pope ; whilst the Catholic made his approaches gradually and cautiously against it from the hope, constantly entertained, that there was a sentiment existing within, which would lead to a voluntary surrender of the citadel, and thus save him the hazard of a storm. The Puritan wished to cut off the possibility of the existence of that sentiment, by removing from sight and hearing every bond of sympathy or tie of association which might tempt to a return. And this it was which gave rise to the disputes about forms, the sign of the cross in baptism, the wearing of the surplice, the ring in marriage, the nature of which superficial thinkers have since marvelled at rather than understood. To the reformer, these were all so many living signs of the restoration of the Papal supremacy, the strength of which was by no means diminished by the policy, singularly adapted to confirm his worst suspicions, which was put in practice by Archbishop Laud. It is a remarkable circumstance, that the popular impression respecting the probability of such an event has survived in England to this day. And the greatest controversy now going on in the Church, that growing out of the

publication of the "Oxford Tracts," turns upon this single point ; a controversy deemed of consequence enough to receive a distinguished notice in the pages of the very number of the "New York Review" now before us, which contains the charge against the Puritans, that their struggle was not religious, but *only* for the political ascendancy.

The truth is, that there were two very distinct shapes, in which the principles of the Puritans developed themselves, neither of which can with any fairness be put out of sight. The one is to be found in the religious disputes of the period in question, the other is clearly discernible in the Parliamentary History. In both will be seen the same origin of complaint, grievous oppression ; and, in both, the same earnest desire to sustain opinions boldly formed, honestly entertained, and fervently advocated. It is, therefore, with no small surprise, that we notice the reiteration of the word "profession," with so much emphasis, in the extract we have made. We can hardly persuade ourselves, that our brother Reviewers can mean to call in question the good faith, or sincerity in religious feeling, of those whom they attack. But, if they do, we can safely leave them to the enjoyment of their own suspicions, without hazard of injury from their effect. The pillory, the axe, the block, and the gibbet ; the loss of ears and noses, and of the means by which life can be made comfortable and honorable, rather than the surrender of an abstract opinion, form a class of arguments addressed to the minds and hearts of men, which soar far above the range of all ordinary methods of detraction.

The great error of the whole argument of the New York Reviewers, then, rests in a total misconception and consequent misrepresentation of the nature of the religious struggle that took place. They consider it as a mere struggle for power between two regularly organized parties, putting forward certain doctrines as the rallying-points for their members, but resorting to them only to cover a political end, the establishment of their own supremacy. It is difficult to show an instance in which the facts of history have been more singularly perverted. And writers, whose business it was to find some defence for their own hostility, by blackening the character of those whom they oppressed, when ascribing to the Puritans the worst possible intentions, are gravely quoted as authorities

from whom a conclusion may be formed respecting "the light in which these were viewed by their opponents," and a justification implied of the persecution which they suffered. The whole structure of the edifice is artificial in the extreme. There can be no doubt, that the doctrines of the Puritan reformers were generally considered *at court* as unfavorable to monarchy. King James took an early opportunity in his reign to express his opinion upon the matter. He laid down the rule, "No bishop, no king," at the Hampton Court conference, and distinctly announced to the Puritans then present, that "he would make them conform, or harry them out of the land, or else worse." But this surely is no justification for the persecution, which followed under Archbishop Bancroft, and was resumed with tenfold severity by Laud, on account of mere opinion ; nor does it fix upon the Non-conformists, who submitted without resistance, the truth of any of the charges which their malignant enemies were so fond of advancing. The mode of making an extract here and there, from the most violent writers among the Puritans, in order to hold the whole body responsible for the acts of those individuals, is so obviously an enemy's trick, that it is astonishing any fair-minded writer could rely upon it for a moment, to support any position whatsoever. The object was so well understood at the time as to call forth very complete and satisfactory disavowals of the motives imputed ; and these were often made in an authorized shape. "Let the bishops sift well our courses," they say, "since his Majesty's happy entrance in among us, and let them name wherein we have done aught, that may justly be said ill to become the ministers of Jesus Christ. Have we drawn any sword ? Have we raised any tumult ? Have we used any threats ? Hath the state been put into any fear or hazard through us ? Manifold disgraces have been cast upon us, and we have endured them ; the liberty of our ministry hath been taken from us, and (though with bleeding hearts) we have sustained it. We have been cast out of our houses, and deprived of our ordinary maintenance, yet have we blown no trumpet of sedition. These things have gone very near us, and yet did we never so much as entertain a thought of violence. The truth is, we have petitioned the King and state ; and who hath reason to deny us that liberty ? We have craved of the prelates to

deal with us according to law ; and is not this the common benefit of every subject ? We have besought them to convince our consciences by Scripture. Alas ! what would they have us to do ? Will they have us content ourselves with this only, that they are bishops, and therefore for their greatness ought to be yielded to ? The weight of episcopal power may oppress us, but cannot convince us.”

We have not yet seen a particle of evidence to show, that these declarations were not perfectly sincere, and founded in truth. We have not seen a shadow of proof, that there was any struggle for power, or contest for the supremacy in the Church, or that the “end sought” was any other than the “end professed.” The words of violent individuals may pass for what they are worth, but they cannot bind the greater number who were not consenting to them ; and there is not a solitary act of violence, on their side, until a very late period in the contest. The truth is, that there was plenty of purely political questions, which took the lead in the public attention. The struggle of the Puritans was one of resistance to the King. The violence of Laud drew the storm upon the Church ; and, if that was crumbled to the dust in the process, the Church must thank him, and him only, for the result. If the religious contest finally sunk in the political one, he made it do so, and forced upon his opponents the necessity of going over his body, which he voluntarily interposed between them and their ultimate object, the overthrow of a usurping sovereign.

In this statement of the question we do not propose to persist without ample authority. But, that we may not weary and embarrass our readers with numerous citations, we are willing, once for all, to rest the foundation of our case upon the testimony of Lord Clarendon himself. We do so with the more confidence, as his bias, both in religion and politics, cannot be questioned, and as what he says, if satisfactory to anybody, ought to be so to all members of the Church of England. Speaking of that period, when the tide of colonization was most rapidly setting towards Massachusetts, he says ;

“ It was now a time of great ease and tranquillity ; the King (as hath been said before) had made himself superior to all those difficulties and straits he had to contend with, the four

first years he came to the crown at home ; and was now revered by all his neighbours, who needed his friendship and desired to have it ; the wealth of the kingdom notorious to all the world, and the general temper and humor of it little inclined to the Papist and less to the Puritan. There were some late taxes and impositions introduced, which rather angered than grieved the people, who were more than repaid by the quiet, peace, and prosperity they enjoyed ; and the murmur and discontent, that was, appeared to be against the excess of power exercised by the crown, and supported by the judges in Westminster-Hall. *The church was not repined at, nor the least inclination to alter the government and discipline thereof, or to change the doctrine. Nor was there at that time any considerable number of persons of any valuable condition throughout the kingdom, who did wish either ;* and the cause of so prodigious a change in so few years after, was too visible from the effects. *The Archbishop's heart was set upon the advancement of the church, in which he well knew he had the King's full concurrence, which he thought would be too powerful for any opposition ; and that he should need no other assistance."*

What shall we now say to this new-fangled theory, which makes the Puritans the victims of a persecution they brought upon themselves for their political and not their religious opinions ? What can we do but pass it by with the contemptuous wonder which it merits, and proceed at once to the next proposition which follows it ? And, that we may do this no injustice, we beg leave to extract it in its original deformity.

“ When the Puritans left England, they did it, not because they could not ‘ worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences,’ but because they could not obtain the political ascendancy which they sought.”

“ It was under the circumstances above described, that several of the leading Puritans petitioned for charters and grants, authorizing them to establish colonies in this then western wilderness ; and the government, not unwilling to be rid of those they considered the leaders of a dangerous faction, unhesitatingly granted them the most full and ample powers, for carrying their designs into execution. This was a most favorable juncture for those who wished for liberal grants of *power*, as well as of *property*. Several corporations had been created for purposes of trade, with extensive political powers. These corporations comprised the two principles

of corporate powers for purposes of trade, and political power for purposes of self-government. They united the character of *trading companies* with that of the most highly famed *municipal corporations* at home. Singular as such bodies may seem to us, the creation of them at that time, was one of the most natural things in the world. And it was the creation of these bodies, anomalous in their character and design, that *originated* and *perpetuated* those principles of *civil liberty*, which form at once the basis and characteristic of our political institutions. The oft-repeated assertion, that our Puritan ancestors *discovered* those principles, is without the least foundation. So far from this, their history shows that they did not even appreciate, if they understood, the genius of the institutions which had been created for them. Consequently, some of the very first acts which they performed were to enact laws, abridging the liberty granted to the colonists by their charters. It is a question indeed of much interest, whether they would not have extinguished some of the most liberal features of their charters, had it not been for the supervision of the government at home. Certain it is, that the violation of their charters, on this identical point, was one of the charges made against the colonists, and this was one of the reasons for depriving Massachusetts of her charter. *Strange, therefore, as it may sound to the ears of some of our readers, the truth is, that we owe the protection of the liberties of the subjects of the colonies, not to the Puritans, but to the King of England. It was not the Puritans who resisted the encroachment of the King, but the King and his Council that restrained the Puritan governors within the bounds of their charters.*" — pp. 61, 62.

It does sound strange enough to hear Charles the First called the protector of liberty in any shape, much more in that of the men whom he so cordially hated. If the fact is so, then has he been most shockingly belied by his best friends, and not by us. But strange as the assertion, now for the first time advanced, may be, it does not appear to us a whit more strange than all the rest of the passage in which it stands. There is a contempt of facts about it, that is positively overwhelming. It is by no means clear, that the motive for granting these charters was to get rid of the leaders of a dangerous faction. The fact, that Bancroft at an early period, and Laud afterwards, procured orders for the detention of many who were going, at a time when the policy, if policy there had been in it, was in the full career

of successful accomplishment, is in direct contradiction to any such supposition. The distinction made in the treatment of the several colonies is entirely overlooked. It should be remembered, that the first settlers at Plymouth were separatists from the church when they left Europe ; whereas those who came to Massachusetts still remained members, although unwilling to conform in all things. Accordingly, the former could get no patent, nor any assurance whatsoever of a positive nature, that they would be protected. The latter, on the contrary, obtained a charter, it is true, but one which gave no rights whatever to the colonists as such, but conferred upon a company in England, and *within easy reach of the crown*, the privilege of making settlements upon this side of the water. Nothing could be more arbitrary, nor more regardless of the principles of civil liberty, than the first organization of the corporation, as it was proposed to take place, under the natural and ordinary construction of that instrument whilst it remained in England. The King had granted nothing that looked like a privilege to the settlers, but had placed every thing of the kind within the discretion of a few persons under his eye. It is not too much to say, that, had there been no change from this view of the subject after the charter was granted, there would have been no colony to speak of. The condition precedent with the family of Winthrop, and all the persons who became principal settlers, was, *that the patent should go with them*. This, and not the patent, was the secret of all our liberty ; for, as one of our principal historians has correctly remarked, it was this which “effectually changed a commercial corporation into an independent provincial government.” It was thus, that the eagle burst forth from what appeared, at first sight, to be but an unpromising shell. The civil liberty of this colony, then, grew out of a very bold construction of the instrument of settlement, and by no means from that instrument itself. And for that construction we are indebted to the Puritans. They therefore did “*originate* and perpetuate those principles, which form at once the basis and characteristic of our political institutions.” Assuredly they did not “*discover*” them, nor were we aware, until the extract we have quoted announced it, that any good authority had ever pretended that they did, — for these were

known, in theory, long before, — but they have the merit of being the first who ever carried them successfully from theory into practice.

The assertion, that “our ancestors did not even appreciate, *if they understood*, the genius of the institutions which had been created for them,” can only appear ludicrous to all those who reflect upon the relative position which the parties to the contract occupy in our memory while yet in England. The idea, that Pym, Hambden, Vane, and all their associates among the Puritans, should be put to school to learn the alphabet of freedom from the lips of Charles the First, “supported,” as Clarendon writes in the passage already quoted, “by the judges in Westminster-Hall,” is enough to make one marvel at human folly. We will turn from such a spectacle to the refreshing admissions of a zealous churchman, who, though every page which he writes sparkles with the fire of prejudice, is yet too manly not to concede at once what his common sense dictated to be true. The following is the language of Dr. Southey, in his “Book of the Church.”

“By steadily enforcing discipline, Laud corrected many of the disorders at which his predecessor [Abbot] had conived. The churches were placed in decent repair, the service was regularly performed, the sacrament reverently administered. *They who would not follow the rubric were silenced* ; and by refusing to ordain any person, except to a cure of souls, the number of Calvinistic Lecturers was diminished, and of those who, being retained as chaplains in the families of private gentlemen, disgraced the church by conforming to the humors and fancies of their patrons, by their incapacity, or by the irregularity of their lives. At the same time, through his munificent encouragement of learning, and his judicious patronage, means were taken for supplying the Establishment with men every way qualified for their holy office. The most zealous of the Non-conformists, alike impatient of submission or of silence, withdrew from the kingdom ; some to Holland, others to New England, whither the most strenuous of their parliamentary adherents, believing that the triumph of the Establishment was complete, would have followed them, if the vessel in which they were actually embarked had not been embargoed. From that act events of greater importance

to society resulted, than was depending upon the ship which carried Cæsar and his fortunes; for Pym, Hambden, and Cromwell were on board. *Had these men been allowed to emigrate, the kingdom might have remained in peace, but it would have been under an absolute government, the tendency of which is inevitably to corrupt the rulers and degrade the nation.*" — Vol. II. pp. 358, 359.

So much for the protection of liberty by Charles the First. We now pass to the "consideration of the motives which induced the Puritans to leave home," being a point where our brother reviewers advise a pause. And, inasmuch as this is the place from which they begin to make use of the little tract, called the "Planter's Plea," for their particular ends, it may be as well to premise some general idea of its nature and character. It appears to have been written and published very hastily, a short time after the departure of Winthrop and his associates, and with the view of counteracting the effect of some unfavorable reports, which, even then, had been spread abroad, probably by the Brownes upon their return, respecting the designs of the colonists. Its most remarkable feature is, the earnestness with which it denies the existence of any intention, on their part, of separating from the Church of England, and the steady manner in which it proceeds upon the assumption, that no such motive could have swayed them when they left the mother country. This position is very much corroborated by the tenor of the farewell letter, dated on board the *Arabella*, from Yarmouth, and goes far to dispel the suspicion our contemporary strives to rouse, that they left "because they could not obtain the political ascendancy which they sought." They were probably reluctant to conform at home, and this, gradually and almost insensibly to themselves, widened into a total separation in the colony, where no opposite inducement existed to counteract that tendency. But, as such a view would by no means suit the purpose of the New York Reviewers, the way in which they resist it is not a little curious. They quote from the "Plea" in the following candid and impartial manner.

"The Plea," they say, "commences with an examination of the ground and warrant of colonies. The second chapter is an answer to the question, 'What ends may be proposed in planting colonies?' To this the author answers, first; 'Some

and the *worst*, and the least warrantable, are such as are only swayed by private respects ; as when men shift themselves and draw others with them out of their countries, *out of undutiful affection to governors, to exempt themselves from subjection to lawful power* ; or aim at a great name to themselves and to raise their own glory.' " — pp. 62, 63.

Now, let it be particularly noted, that this extract, made in the manner aforeshown, and with the passage in italics as it is *not* in the original, is so prepared as to leave an impression on the mind of the reader, that it was intended by the writer to apply to the Puritan colonists. So far from this being the truth, precisely the contrary is the case. For had the paragraph been continued but a line or two, it would have shown the instances to be "the Spanish and Dutch colonies in the East Indies," and "many colonies of the Romanes in Italy and other lands" ; and it would have further shown, that these are expressly cited to put them in *unfavorable* contrast with such colonies as are planted from "the desire and respect unto the publishing his [God's] name where it is not knowne, and reducing men, that live without God in this present world, into a forme of piety and godlinesse," which "*end, in plantation, hath bene specially reserved for this later end of the world.*" But this example of falsification of authority is not the only one in the article we are now examining. For instance, after a series of partial quotations, which it would be sheer waste of time in us to expose, when we have so much of more consequence to do, it proceeds ;

"Our Author [that is, the Planter,] then goes on to speak more at large of the *motives* which induced them to come. He says, 'As it were absurd to conceive they have all one mind, so it were more ridiculous to imagine they all have one scope. *Necessity*, may press some ; *novelty* draw others ; *hopes of gain* may prevail with a third sort ;' but he is persuaded, 'that the most sincere and godly part have the advancement of the Gospel for their main scope.'

"These facts, and abundance of others, of a similar nature, contained in the work, authorize the inference, that the colonists were regarded as factious persons, and that their opponents did not credit the pretension, that the advancement of the Gospel was the *sole* or *chief* object of their emigration. It is here also confessed, by one of the party, that 'necessity,'

'novelty,' and 'hope of gain,' as well as love of the Gospel, were among the causes that moved the colonists to come to this country; and, moreover, that the reasons for preferring New England to any other place, were the facilities for trading and the health of the country. The hope of propagating the Gospel among the heathen was one, but, according to their own showing, a secondary object with the Planters. In short, their own account of themselves shows that *they were men*; just such men, in fact, as had lived a thousand times before, and no doubt will live a thousand times again."—pp. 63, 64.

There is a short text of Scripture appended to the title-page of the "Planter's Plea," which we perceived to have been omitted in the transfer to the pages of our New York contemporary. This omission, which we at first were disposed to consider the result of accident, must, on further reflection, be construed as intentional. For it presented too glaring a rebuke to the execution of the purpose proposed in using the book at all, to be either conveniently or comfortably retained. It was not intended to "*prove*" any thing, nor to "*hold fast*" to that which was otherwise than bad. Take, for example, the ungenerous perversion of the candor of the "Planter," in the passage above quoted. He does not confess, as it is pretended, that "necessity," "novelty," and "hopes of gain," *were* among the causes of removal with the colonists. He only argues from general principles, that, where a number of men were acting together, there *might be* a variety of motives impelling them, and these might be some of them; but he immediately goes on to express his undoubting conviction, that the greater part, that is, "*the most, and most sincere and godly part, have the advancement of the Gospel for their main scope,*" the two first and important words being *entirely omitted* in the review. To suppress such an important member of a quotation, used in argument, must be owned to be rather sharp practice. If there is one opinion running more than another throughout the whole of the eighty-four pages of the tract, if there is one point deemed impregnable by the author in his defence of the colonists, it is that which relates to the object which they had in coming over. He presses it, in every possible shape, as their great recommendation to the affections of the citizens of the mother country, which an attempt was making to alienate from them by the "*jealousie of some distempered*

minde, or by a desperate malicious plot of men *ill affected to religion*." Such men, it goes on to say,

"Such men would be entreated to forbear that base and unchristian course, of traducing innocent persons, under these odious names of separatists and enemies to the church *and state*; for feare, least their own tongues fall upon themselves, by the justice of his hand, who will not faile to clear the innocency of the just, and *to cast backe into the bosome of every slanderer, the filth that he rakes up to throw in other men's faces*." — p. 78.

It is undeniably true, that the Puritans were "*mere men*." Had they been otherwise, we should like to know what would have been their merit. They shared deeply in the lot of humanity, and partook of its vicissitudes. But, whether in prosperity or in adversity, they had one virtue, which no circumstances nor suspicions can deprive them of; we mean that of being devoted followers of the path they believed to be right. They have been traduced, from their own day even down to ours; but this has only served to make their character rise higher at the cost of their maligners. It is an old remark of the French humorist, Montaigne, "*Donnez-moi la plus belle action du monde, je vous ferai voir qu'elle peut avoir eu cinquante méchans motifs*;" but he who goes about to assign them rather betrays his own grovelling propensities, than takes off from the beauty of the act he depreciates. Yet, inasmuch as the motives of the colonists have been impugned, and it is broadly affirmed, in the article we are now considering, that the design they had in view, whether at Plymouth, or Boston, or New Haven, or Hartford, was "*commercial*," we propose to throw together, in a desultory manner, a few passages from the accounts given by themselves, which will, we trust, prove perfectly satisfactory to every unprejudiced reader.

"And thus much," says Elder Cushman, at Plymouth, in 1621, in an Epistle Dedicatory to the adventurers for New England, in the mother country, — "and thus much, I will say for the satisfaction of such as have any thought of going thither to inhabit; that for men which have a large heart, and *look after great riches*, ease, pleasure, dainties, and jollity in this world, (except they will live by other men's sweat or have great riches,) I would not advise them to come there, for

as yet the country will afford no such matters ; *but, if there be any who are content to lay out their estates, spend their time, labors, and endeavours, for the benefit of them that shall come after, and in desire to further the Gospel among these poor Heathens*, quietly contenting themselves with such hardship and difficulties as by God's providence shall fall upon them, being yet young and in their strength, such men I would advise and encourage to go, *for their ends cannot fail them."*

"And for that the propagating of the Gospel," write the Governor and Deputie of the New England Company for a Plantation in Massachusetts Bay, in their first letter of instructions to Endicott, in 1629, "is the thing wee do profess above all to bee our ayme in settling this plantacon, wee have been careful to make plentiful provision of Godly ministers, by whose faithful preaching, Godly conversacon and exemplary lyfe, *wee trust not only those of our owne nation will be built up in the knowledge of God, but also the Indians may, in God's appointed tyme, bee reduced to the obedience of the Gospel of Christ, &c."*

"Lastly, and which was not the least," says Morton's Preface to the Plymouth Church Records, "a great hope and inward zeale they had of laying some good foundation, or at least, to make some way theirunto, for the propagating and advancing the Gospel of the kingdom of Christ, in those remote parts of the world, yee though they should be but as stepping-stones unto others for performing of soe great a work."

But we have neither room nor patience to quote all that we find in the "General Considerations for the Plantation of New England," the agreement between the settlers at New Plymouth, the original church covenant in Massachusetts, and in every other paper that emanated, directly or indirectly, from the Puritans during the first fifty years of the settlements, to show, that, either in one shape or another, religious feeling was uppermost in every thing which they undertook. Nor yet was it at all inconsistent in them, or derogatory to this motive, that they paid some regard to mere worldly convenience. If they "preferred New England to any other place for its facilities of trade and the health of the country," we are not aware, that religion would dictate that they should do otherwise. They were not bound, by the law of God, to starve nor to catch fevers. It is one of the peculiar and striking characteristics of the

Puritan colonists, and one for which they deserve commendation rather than censure, that, with enthusiasm upon points of faith, carried to so great a height as they carried it, should have been joined in them a great deal of sound, practical, English good sense upon every-day matters. This infused itself into every part of their system of self-government, and gave to it that steadiness which carried them so successfully through the violent collisions of opinion, that followed each other with great rapidity during the first years of the principal settlement. And it prevented them from becoming the laughing-stock of the world, as many wiser men in their own conceit, with far greater claims for reputation, have become, when they have attempted to reduce their theories to practice.

We must, then, still maintain for New England, that the foundation of her settlements presents a scene of moral sublimity not often witnessed in the history of the world. And until now we had indulged the hope, that all intelligent and educated minds, no matter what their shades of faith or their prejudices upon religious questions might be, were in the present age united in this opinion. What, then, was our surprise may well be judged, when our New York brethren were found to look down upon the whole proceeding with contempt. For of the men who made the settlements they say,

“Instead of looking *down* upon them, as on a point *some-what below ourselves*, where our ancestors did, in most respects, actually stand, we look at them through a highly refracting medium ; so that, to him who is ignorant of the facts in regard to them, they seem to be raised far above the place we now occupy.” — p. 49.

There was once a Pharisee, who “thanked God that he was not *even as this publican*.” Self-reliance is certainly a virtue, but it sometimes terminates in over-assurance, and then becomes a fault. When we reflect upon the nature of the sacrifices which have immortalized the fame of the Puritans, we think it requires some confidence in the easy and luxurious livers of the present day to claim, that they would be equal to making the same if they were tried. And they, who look *down* upon the Puritans, must have formed rare habits of looking up at themselves. “*Haud equidem in-*

video, miror magis." We cannot enter into these feelings. We cannot bring to mind the circumstances, under which, for the love of truth in the abstract, as these persons conscientiously apprehended it, they were willing to tear up at once all the roots of association with home, and friends, and native land, to transplant themselves into a cold, and naked, and desolate country, where the original stocks must be content to remain stunted, even though they might put forth new and thriving scions for another generation to enjoy ; we say, we cannot bring to mind all these things without at once and involuntarily exclaiming, — These were *not* ordinary men. We should never be so bold as to engage for ourselves, that we could follow them, albeit at an humble distance and with unequal steps. We would at all events be spared the trial ; for, if heroism is the child of adversity, it is not the less a parent of great personal suffering. We honor it, because it rises *above* the ordinary strain of social doctrine. Happy they, who, like our brethren, feel the assurance, before trial, of future success in such a vocation ! We, who have not yet reached that pass, cannot, like them, be dispensed from looking *up* to our ancestors now, as we have ever done.

We know that the next topic is somewhat threadbare, and that we have already tried the patience of our readers ; but we nevertheless feel it impossible to avoid noticing the position, that "our civil and religious liberty exists, not in consequence, but in spite, of the spirit and genius of Puritanism." Even Hume, with all his contempt of religious professions, did not venture to go so far. His cold cynicism spared something for a bolder intolerance to decry. We shall not commit the absurdity of an argument directly upon the proposition ; particularly since we should be running into unequal competition with that which forms the very strongest part of Mr. Bancroft's historical work. Our purpose will be confined to the consideration of the reasons given in affirmation of what they assert. It did so happen, that Mr Bacon ventured to state, that "the one great purpose of extending the kingdom of God determined the form, the spirit, and the working of the civil institutions of the Puritans," at which our brethren take great exception, as we must venture to think, with very small justification. That it determined the

form is clearly enough shown in the great mixture of the Mosaic Law in the original code of the colony. That it determined the spirit and working is also manifest, both in the peculiar form of the government, as it was administered, and in the restriction of the right of franchise to those who were church-members, which secured a control over the mode of administration. This restriction, however, constitutes the great point of objection to the truth of Mr. Bacon's assertion, as well as of support to the broad attack upon Puritanism above cited, which it is our present desire to consider.

Now, in regard to the right and wrong of such a measure, when considered in the abstract, and without reference to any of the circumstances under which men commonly act, we do not imagine, that there would, at this day, be more than one opinion. But the moment, when we take it out of this negative position, and begin to surround it with the events and passions of common life, is that when the judgment must be called in, and sound discrimination exercised. We are free to confess, that we have always regarded it as the greatest evidence of worldly wisdom which the Puritans displayed, although it is not probable that it was adopted solely upon that ground. The idea of expecting any principles of liberty from the supervision of the government at home, was not exactly that which, from their experience, would ever have readily suggested itself in connexion with the names of Charles, and of the Archbishop of Canterbury. To them, these were names of terror here, as they had been there ; because they were indelibly graven upon their memory in association with the sacrifices they had been compelled to elect, rather than to surrender their convictions. They did not come to America without an object. That object probably was, to worship God in the manner which they liked best, and to secure to themselves a spot in which they might carry into execution their wish to perpetuate their modes of thought. To effect this, they laid down every thing deemed valuable on earth ; and hence the estimate they placed upon the successful attainment of it, was commensurate with the price it had cost them. They sowed in tears, that they might reap in joy. There was not a moment during the infancy of the colony, in which it was not in danger from enemies on both sides of the Atlantic.

There was not a moment in which the Puritans were not exposed to the danger of seeing the edifice of their erection completely overturned. That edifice was a sort of theocratic government, embodying their religious and their political notions, derived in a somewhat complex manner from the study of the Scriptures, and the genuine English principles with which they were deeply imbued. That this form of government was the result of a natural and simple construction of the charter which they had received, can hardly be maintained. They had probably themselves no small misgivings upon that subject. Yet it was the ability, in some sort, to protect that form, by holding over it the shield of the charter, which gave to that instrument its importance in their eyes ; and for the sake of this, and this only, did it have value at all with them. Now the fact, that enemies to that form existed in their own camp from the day of their landing, who eagerly sought for opportunities to break it down, was well known to them. The further fact, that those enemies were in direct communication with, and probably in the pay of, powerful chiefs at home, to whom no method of personal recommendation was likely to prove so strong, as the exposure of deeds which might be charged against the Puritans in Massachusetts as offences, is at this time pretty thoroughly made out, and was suspected even in their day. Gorges and Mason, Gardiner and Morton, Bennett, Maverick, and Gorton, men of very dissimilar character, and operated upon by opposite inducements, yet were all ready to unite with equal zeal to pull down what they could not hope to control. It was the requiring a qualification of church-membership to make a freeman, which pulled the fangs out of most of these serpents, and made them harmless against the infant settlement.

It is worthy of remark also, that the chief charges which these complainants were fond of preferring by no means correspond with those, which their successors of the "New York Review" desire to bring forward. They affirm, that the object of the Puritans was total independence, "*not new discipline*, but sovereignty," as Bennett says, in his letter to Archbishop Laud, an inference which he very naturally drew from their well-grounded apprehensions of the tyranny of his correspondent. Now, that the men who had been at so great pains

of body and mind to set up a civil and religious state, such as they deemed nearest to perfection of all they could imagine on this earth, should, when they had got it well established, stand ready to throw open to its enemies, at home and abroad, every avenue through which they could most effectively destroy it, appears to us to be expecting of them a degree of infatuated simplicity, which would have been far from doing them honor. Scarcely four years elapsed, before Laud had procured himself to be placed at the head of a commission, by means of which his arm, that had driven the Puritans from their homes in Great Britain, might be made long enough to reach them even in the spot of their refuge. The king's Attorney-general was at the same time following up the legal measures necessary to make the charter null, and serving his writ upon the company *in England*, thus clearly manifesting his sense of the meaning of the patent. It is true, that the Puritans still retained powerful friends, who loved and respected them too much, not strenuously, and at moments successfully, to resist the measures of hostility with which they were threatened. Yet, after all, it was only that revolution, which hurled the monarch from his throne, and brought the head of his church and himself to the block, that saved the colony from disorganization and despair. For the repeal of the charter would probably have been the signal for general dispersion to places without the jurisdiction of Britain, where ecclesiastical tyranny and Stuart despotism could not come.

But the New York Reviewers, when at all pressed by the continual proofs given by the Puritans of their attachment to liberty, strive to evade them by affirming that it was only the liberty of doing as they pleased. If by this it is meant to imply, that they pleased to do any thing which good morals, or religion, or their civil duties, would forbid, then is the insinuation so completely set at nought by the whole tenor of their records, that it is not worthy of a second thought. Generally speaking, colonists come from the less settled classes of society, who leave it to get rid of the restrictions upon the indulgence of their habits, which established laws and customs commonly impose. But the Puritans were an exception to this rule, inasmuch as, being members of a fixed population at home, they voluntarily and cheerfully imposed upon themselves, in their new state, rules of dis-

cipline even more rigid than those which they had left. There is no other such example in history. And it was quite as much from dislike of this discipline, which was by no means suited to people of vicious habits, as from any other motive, that men like Gardiner and Morton were first drawn into acts of hostility against the colony. Had it been less tolerant of gross immorality, perhaps Laud would have lost two of his most efficient coadjutors. Had they found a greater degree of that liberty which means license, and less of that which signifies law, they might have remained to contaminate our atmosphere with the breath of their freedom. If such men were among the instruments, through whom "the supervision of the government at home was exercising itself to retain the most liberal features of the charters" against the efforts of the Puritans, then is it very clear to us, that the latter were perfectly right in adopting the most vigorous measures to counteract their influence.

In truth, the period of thirty years from the first settlement at Plymouth, in 1620, was one of continual and incessant anxiety to the Puritans. And, even after the Church of England had fallen, they were not without fears of the authority of the Westminster Assembly, which made demonstration of a disposition to rule over them. The successful resistance made to the attempt conclusively proves how little they felt of sympathy with either party in that contest for the supremacy between the Church and Presbytery, into which our New York brethren seek so earnestly to impel them. They were of the class of Independents, who had no protectors with a particle of good-will in the highest places in England, until Cromwell came forward, and took into his own hands the reins of government, which the contention of others contributed quite as much as any efforts of his own to place there.

It is a striking passage in one of the historical works of Mr. Sharon Turner, in which, upon looking back at the peculiar coincidences which seemed absolutely requisite to the production of the Reformation, and which at the fitting moment did accordingly happen, he deduces, from what to mortal eyes were mere accidents, an inference of the existence of "a mysterious force perceptibly operative, which alters and overturns human affairs, and tramples down dignity and power."

And after extorting the unwilling homage of the Epicurean Lucretius to this truth,

“ Usque adeo res humanas VIS ABDITA quædam
Obterit ; et pulchros fasces sævasque secures
Proculcare, ac ludibrio sibi habere videtur,”

he leads the philosophical student gradually, but certainly, to identify it with a provident God. With very similar feelings to his, have we often called to mind the remarkable train of events which singularly concurred, from both sides of the Atlantic, to develope a wholly new system of social polity in this quarter of the globe. It would seem as if every shade of opinion in the old world had, in the first place, had its opportunity of occupying a place upon the new, and as if these had all been continually subjected since to mutual attrition and reciprocal modification, as well by reason of the closer drawing of the ties of intercourse between them, as of the process of fusion, which goes on even to this day in the new settlements. Whatever the ultimate result of this new formation of character may be, which cannot now be foreseen by the wisest, the share which the Puritan settlements of New England will have contributed can never be overlooked, even by the most superficial of observers. It surely was not for nothing, that they passed through the seven times heated furnace of affliction, and brought out with them in safety the institutions which they cherished as the apple of their eye. Nor yet was it for nothing, that they emerged from the critical age of revolutions without having been called to battle, and, with their social system hardened into strength, at the very moment when that of the mother country was crumbling into its original elements under the effect of ferocious conflicts. There may be some persons, who would find fault with them for resolutely adhering to the only mode, by which these results could have been brought about ; and others, who might not have been inclined to regret it, if a hazardous liberality had ended in Massachusetts, as it did in the Catholic colony of Maryland, by establishing the authority of the English church. We hold no community of feeling with such men, wherever they may be. For, had this result been the will of Providence, New England must have ceased to be New England, and her subsequent history would have borne another face upon its pages. We respect the talents, and the learn-

ing, and the piety, which have distinguished the Church of England. But we do not forget, that passive submission to the divine right of kings has been a political doctrine not unfrequently heard in former days in her pulpits, nor that the test of church-membership has until very lately been applied at every avenue to official distinction in Great Britain. Hence, if there was intolerance among us, her example was not likely to have relieved us from the odium we incur on account of it ; whilst her high-toned monarchical theories might have had a wide sphere of influence at a subsequent day, and have thrown much weight into the scale of the mother country, when the ultimate struggle for independence came on.

We now come down to the last charge, and the only one with a show of good foundation, which we see in the whole article of our New York contemporaries ; the charge of religious intolerance. And, inasmuch as this is by no means a very new charge, nor one which is commonly denied to be just, nor one which either Professor Kingsley or Mr. Bacon undertakes to repel, we were a little surprised to see such a labor of quotation to establish it. The object appears to have been to bring it to bear upon civil questions, with which it has nothing to do. The institutions of the colonies were founded upon the principles of freedom, *not* made for the Puritans in their earlier charters, but deduced from them by themselves, notwithstanding that their religion was intolerant. The same fact was observable at the same time in the mother country, with only the addition, that a monarch and a bishop were adopting "Thorough" as their motto in the labor of subversion. The mind of man had hardly been long enough liberated from Papal shackles, to find its way to the ultimate consequences of a new principle. The lesson of tolerating what we consider to be erroneous opinions, is one at all times learned with great difficulty, and particularly where the subjects of difference are thought to be of momentous importance. Even when perfectly understood, which is scarcely the case before mature age, the practice of it is carried on under the perpetual resistance of man's passions and prejudices. Contention will inevitably breed anger, and this, in its turn, stimulates to immoderate triumph after victory, instead of that sacrificing concession, to make which throws the struggle inward upon one's self. We are not very sure, that even in

our day and generation, when we are so much inclined to boast of our superior light, there are not occasional evidences furnished us of the existence of a temper, which would need only the same power and the same provocation that Romanism had, again to kindle the fires of Smithfield, and to revive the watchword of St. Bartholomew. We do not censure any intolerant measures of the Puritans the less on that account ; but, in view of their comparative ignorance of the truth, we are disposed to temper our sentence with mercy. Let him only who is wholly without sin in this respect cast the first stone. We seek to vent no reproaches upon unconscious error.

Nothing remains, if we except a trifling and somewhat hypercritical objection, made to the mode in which Mr. Bacon speaks of the settlements with the Indians for lands. We had supposed the main point involved to be the spirit in which the Puritans treated their claim of ownership, but are met with an application of the principle laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *Johnson vs. McIntosh*, in 1823 ; a method of treating the subject, which we suppose is the natural effect of the preference, acknowledged so frankly by our brethren, of the doctrines of their own age over those of their predecessors. But, as some of our readers may still wish to know precisely what those predecessors thought of the subject, without the light of our modern judges to guide them, we will venture to quote for their satisfaction from the instructions given to Endicott by the government of the Company, upon the occasion of the first settlement of Massachusetts.

“ Whereas in our last, wee advised you to make composicon with such of the salvages as did pretend any tittle, or lay clayme to any of the land within the territoryes granted to us by his Majesty's charter, wee pray you now, bee carefull to discover and find out all such pretenders, and by advice of the councell there to make such reasonable composicon with them, as may free us and yourselves from any scruple of intrusion ; and to this purpose, if it might be convenyently done, to compound and conclude with them all, or as many as you can, at one tyme, not doubting but, by your discreet ordering of this business, the Natives wil-be willing to treat and compound with you upon very easie conditions.”

We do not intend to go into the consideration of the nice question in political economy, whether the consideration given according to these instructions was an equivalent or not. It

is sufficient for us, that whatever title the Indians pretended to claim was met by acknowledgment, and a readiness to make compensation for the property taken. Inasmuch as value passed on both sides, it seems to us fair enough to consider the transactions as bargains, in which each party obtained articles they valued more, in exchange for such as they valued less. The mere fact, that the Indians' deeds contain the words "give, grant, and yield up," will be no argument against this view of the subject to those who remember, that most deeds in fee simple run in a similar manner. It is a remark made by Hutchinson, that the lands thus obtained were, with some exceptions, not worth the cost which it had taken to bring them into cultivation ; so that, after all, the Indians may have obtained, for their qualified right of possession, quite as much as any person would consider its value. In the whole matter we see no stress to be laid upon any portion, excepting that which manifests the spirit of justice, and respect for the rights of others, in which the settlement commenced. And this we do not understand our brethren of New York as wishing to dispute.

We have now done with the article upon the "Politics of the Puritans" in the "New York Review" ; an article which, we must be allowed to think, does no honor to the pages of that able magazine, and which, for a disingenuous use of authorities, and an illiberal spirit, upon colonial history, has not been exceeded since the days of George Chalmers. Perhaps, if the authors should again incline to search out materials in the "Planter's Plea" for an attack upon the motives and principles of our ancestors, they will give more deliberate consideration to the passages with which we now close our task. We recommend them most particularly to their attention, for the manly and generous tone which contrasts so strongly with their own.

"Now, for the better preventing of such suspicions and jealousies, and the ill affections to this worke, that may arise thereupon ; two things are earnestly requested of such as passe their censures upon it, or the persons that undertake it. The first is, that although in this barren and corrupt age, wherein we live, all our actions are generally swayed and carried on by private interests ; insomuch as sincere intentions of furthering the common good (grounded upon that love through which wee are commanded to serve one another) be the won-

ders of men ; notwithstanding, men would not thinke it impossible, that the love which waxeth cold and dyeth in the most part, yet may revive and kindle in some men's hearts ; and that there may be found some that may neglect their ease and profit to doe the church good and God service, out of a sincere love and affection to God's honour and the church's good. Or if, in the world's infancy, men out of an ambitious humour, or at present for private advantages and expectation of gaine, thrust themselves out from their own dwellings into parts farre remote from their native soyle ; why should not we conceive, that, if they doe this for a corruptible crowne, that the desire and expectation of an incorruptible (the reward of such as deny themselves for the service of God and his Church) may as strongly allure such as by patient continuance in well-doing seeke immortalitie and life ? And yet the favourable conceits that men entertaine of such as follow, in all their actions, the wages of their private gaine, and the jealousies that they are apt to entertaine of such as pretend onely the advancement of the Gospell, manifestly argue that the generall opinion of the world is, that some may be true to themselves and the advancement of their owne private estates, but hardly any to God and his Church. I should be very unwilling to thinke, they cherish this suspection upon that ground, that moved that sensuall Emperor to beleieve that no man was cleane or chaste in any part of his body, because himselfe was defiled and uncleane in all. This is then the first favour that is desired, of such as consider this action, to beleieve that it is neither impossible nor unlikely, that these men's intentions are truely and really such as they pretend, and not colours and cloakes for secret dangerous purposes which they closely harbour in their breasts, especially when all apparent circumstances concur to justifie the contrary." — pp. 79, 80.

ART. VII. — *Geschichte der Hellenischen Dichtkunst*, von Dr. GEORG HEINRICH BODE, Assessor der philosophischen Facultät zu Göttingen. — *Erster Band. Geschichte der Epischen Dichtkunst der Hellenen bis auf Alexandros den Grossen.* — *Zweiter Band. Geschichte der Lyrischen Dichtkunst der Hellenen bis auf Alexandros den Grossen.* *Erster Theil. Ionische Lyrik, nebst Abhandlungen über*